

Now that he has gone away there is only his work to live on, but that work will continue the influence for good and understanding which he promoted during the time he was with us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the joint resolution enacted by the Legislature of Vermont declaring Robert Lee Frost to be the poet laureate of the State of Vermont; and also the Joint Resolution R. 33 of the Vermont Legislature, expressing felicitations to Robert Frost on his 87th birthday.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION R-59

Joint resolution declaring Robert Lee Frost to be the poet laureate of the State of Vermont (J.R.H. 54)

Whereas the fame of the poet Robert Frost is worldwide and unsurpassed; and

Whereas at the inauguration of the President of the United States he performed the duty, without the name of a poet laureate, and

Whereas he has for many of his years chosen to live in Vermont: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That Robert Lee Frost be declared the poet laureate of the State of Vermont; and be it further

Resolved, That His Excellency the Governor be requested to present to him on some fitting occasion, a copy of this resolution.

Approved: July 5, 1961.

JOINT RESOLUTION R-33

Joint resolution expressing appreciation to Robert Frost (J.R.H. 28)

Whereas Robert Frost, the distinguished poet who makes his home at Breadloaf in the town of Ripton and State of Vermont, has been recently honored by participating in the inauguration ceremonies of the President of the United States; and

Whereas Robert Frost has been awarded many degrees, and prizes and a special Congressional Gold Medal for his poetry; and

Whereas Robert Frost has been further honored by being appointed as Consultant in Poetry to the Library of Congress for the years 1958-59; and

Whereas Robert Frost has contributed to the education in America in many schools and colleges and especially in this State by his participation in the Breadloaf English School of Middlebury College and the Breadloaf Writers' Conference; and

Whereas Robert Frost has brought great honor and recognition to his community and the State of Vermont by his contributions to literature and particularly the literature of New England, expressing the spirit of the American people and the native Vermonter; and

Whereas Robert Frost is greatly beloved and held in high esteem by his neighbors in Ripton, his students, his friends in Vermont, and many people throughout the Nation and world; and

Whereas Robert Frost will reach his 87th birthday on March 26, 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the senate and house of representatives of the State of Vermont do hereby express the pride of the people of the State of Vermont in having Mr. Frost live here, extend to him their deep appreciation for the great honor, distinction, and recognition which he has brought to the State by his presence and his achievements, and wish him many more fruitful and happy years; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to send a certified copy of this joint resolution to Robert Frost.

Approved: March 14, 1961.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am sure we are all saddened by the news of the passing of Robert Frost.

In a world of complicity and complexity, he tried to turn our eyes toward the fundamental truths and the virtues of the simple and honest life.

Robert Frost was the soul of Vermont and mankind and it will be a long time before we find another who can communicate his universal message to mankind.

Like Socrates, Frost was a gadfly. Once when surrounded by admiring Senators, he spoke not for himself but for all the poets of the earth when he quoted the old lines:

Ten cities claimed the poet Homer dead
Through which the living Homer begged
for bread.

This was Frost speaking for every poet known and unknown—asking that they be allowed a place in a topsy-turvy world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to add a word in memoriam of Robert Frost, and to join other Senators who have spoken on this subject.

It is said, quite properly, that he who sings a nation's songs can make a nation's history.

Robert Frost bespoke the heart and spirit of our Nation in a modern day, even as Walt Whitman did in another day.

I join with millions of Americans in mourning this loss and, even more important, in drawing attention to the significance of Robert Frost's life, and the beauty which it created, its significance in our national life, and the fact that we shall have the inestimable privilege of drawing sustenance and encouragement from Robert Frost's works through days immemorial.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, four score and 8 years lay gently on the heart of Robert Frost as the poet turned the last page of his poem of life—and America is sad for his passing.

This Capital can be proud—for it gave to millions and millions the background from which they heard and saw this rugged poet of the New Hampshire hills give voice and verse to memorable praise and prayer upon the inauguration of a new President.

The Capital can be sad—for America can ill afford to lose a single voice that speaks with the lasting sweetness of one who can preach philosophy in rolling stanzas—and touch mirth with the melody of his lines.

All America can claim this son of San Francisco and foster son of New England—its schools where he studied and he taught. So his loss is the loss of all America—his poems are the lovely profit of us all. They are the promise of the poet—a promise kept as Robert Frost himself might express it—and did—in these words:

The woods are lovely, dark and deep
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep.

May Robert Frost sleep now in peace—and in his country's pride.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, early this morning, at the Peter Bent Brigham Hospital in Boston, Robert Frost died at the age of 88.

All of us who knew personally America's poet laureate, all across the world who have read and will continue to read his poems, all those who have once climbed a birch or walked a mountain pasture, mourn his passing. He is one of those few people in a generation or a society who simply will never be replaced. Being an artist of spirit and clarity, this awesome thought is transcended by the sturdy fact that the truth and music of his words will be treasured and passed on by generation after generation, shared faithfully and happily by teachers and thinkers and artists to come, always alive.

Robert Frost was a New England poet, and therefore specially beloved and perhaps specially understood by New Englanders. He wanted to be known more as an American poet, and was. But he transcended both regionalism and nationalism, because the spirit he imparted by writing of New England things and New England people is universal, cleanly understood by people in other contexts and climes. We in the Senate, joined by the Members of the House of Representatives, were honored last year, through the President of the United States, to award Robert Frost a gold medal in commemoration of his poetry and the profound contribution it had made to the enrichment of mankind.

This poet once wrote, in a poem called "The Death of the Hired Man," of one who, nearing death, had "nothing to look backward on with pride and nothing to look forward to with hope." We look back for him upon his life's work with the most profound kind of pride even as we ponder on the hope for the future which his poetry gives to us. Robert Frost knew tragedy, but knew beauty better—a strong and a kind man who ennobled those about him. His personality meant much to us in New England. We mourn his loss.

CONTRIBUTION BY SMALL BUSINESSES IN AIR TRANSPORTATION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE DURING CUBAN CRISIS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the dramatic story of how our Nation's civilian and military resources were mobilized to meet the Cuban crisis continues to unfold.

Recently I have learned of the valuable contribution made by the small businesses in air transportation to our national defense during the Cuban crisis. I have been furnished a copy of a letter from Maj. Gen. I. Sewell Morris, commander of the defense traffic management service, to the Independent Airlines Association, national trade organization representing these small airlines, in which official recognition is given to the important role played by these air carriers.

The text of General Morris' letter is:

During the Cuban crisis, this command called upon the carriers you represent to

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1211

operation of that service with the military departments in time of peace in preparation for those wartime duties.

Section 2 amends section 10 of the act of January 19, 1942, chapter 6 (83 U.S.C. 868a), to permit commissioned officers, ships' officers, and members of the crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to purchase available commissary and quartermaster supplies from the Air Force at the prices charged officers and enlisted men of the Air Force. Under present law these officers and members of the Coast and Geodetic Survey may purchase commissary and quartermaster supplies from the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, but not from the Air Force.

Section 3 amends section 1 of the act of December 3, 1942, chapter 670, as amended (83 U.S.C. 854a-1), which provides for the temporary promotion of certain personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency. Specifically, the proposed amendment would confer on the Department of the Air Force the same authority now possessed by the Departments of the Army and Navy to promote, temporarily, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who are under its jurisdiction. It would also permit temporary promotions of commissioned officers in the service of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to fill vacancies in rank and grades caused by transfer of commissioned officers to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Air Force. This provision parallels that now pertaining to the filling of vacancies caused by transfer of such commissioned officers to the Departments of the Army or Navy.

In addition, regularly appointed deck officers and junior engineers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey may be temporarily appointed to ensign, but the total of such temporary appointments may not exceed the number of officers transferred to the military departments (instead of to the Departments of the Army and Navy, as at present).

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no increase in budgetary requirements within the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH S. IMRIZ,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

TRANSFER OF STATUE OF GEN. JOHN A. RAWLINS FROM CITY OF WASHINGTON TO THE CITY OF RAWLINS, WYO.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the transfer of the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins from Rawlins Park at 18th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C., to the city of Rawlins, Wyo. The move would do much to honor a man who served his nation well and would revive and restore his reputation for devotion to duty in the crucial years of crisis during the Civil War. In a city the size of Washington with its multiplicity of memorials to the great men of history a statue of a man who performed admirably in a supporting role is all but ignored.

John A. Rawlins was a country lawyer from Galena, Ill., who served throughout the Civil War as aide-de-camp, adviser, and confidant to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. At the end of the war he was a major general and chief of staff, a position of great responsibility which he filled with enthusiasm and efficiency. At the time of his death in 1869 he was Secretary of War in the Grant Cabinet. Shortly before entering the Cabinet he made a trip

westward to Salt Lake City. On that trip he passed through what is now Rawlins, Wyo., the name being conferred on the settlement in his honor by General Dodge, chief engineer for the Union Pacific Railroad.

Mr. President, the people of Rawlins, Wyo., are proud of the origin of the city name and they are proud of the devotion to country exhibited by General Rawlins. They propose to pay any and all costs incurred in the movement of this statue and to give it a place of honor in a prominent location.

In this location this statue would serve as a continual reminder of the service of this great man—a pleasant contrast to its present state of almost total anonymity here in Washington.

Mr. President, this joint resolution would detract nothing from a city already overcrowded with statues and memorials, would add a note of civic pride to a thriving city in the West and—most important—would bring new and deserved attention to the service and record of one of our Nation's great men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) to authorize the city of Rawlins, Wyo., or an appropriate association or organization of the citizens thereof, to remove to Rawlins, Wyo., the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins located at Rawlins Park, Washington, D.C., introduced by Mr. McGEE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 108) to designate Columbus Day a national holiday, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY) be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 15 and 22, 1963, the names of Senators RANDOLPH, MCCARTHY, CARLSON, MILLER, BARTLETT, FONG, MUNDT, METCALF, LONG of Louisiana, GRUENING, NELSON, MCGOVERN, KUCHEL, ALLOTT, MAGNUSON, KEFAUVER, McGEE, MORSE, HUMPHREY, INOUYE, CASE, HICKENLOOPER, BURDICK, SMATHERS, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the resolutions (S. Res. 30) granting legislative authority to the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted by Mr. PROUTY (for himself and other Senators) on January 15, 1963.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were

ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

Address entitled "Let Us Be Better Americans," delivered by Mr. Harry Ostrov, grand master of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York, at Garden City, Long Island.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

Address delivered by the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

By Mr. McGEE:

Editorial entitled "Mutable Munich," published in the Washington Post of January 29, 1963, dealing with the role played by United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban crisis.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Walter Hall, Banker, Doesn't Act the Part," written by John Rainey and published in the Houston (Tex.) Post of December 10, 1962, being a tribute to Walter Hall, a leading Texas businessman.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Article entitled "The Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius a Century Ago Could Have Saved Russia From Communism," written by John C. Siranka and published in the October 1962 issue of Dobry Pastier—Good Shepherd, dealing with the efforts of Christian democratic leaders in Europe a century ago, who were planning and visualizing a United States of Europe, based on the pattern of our American democracy.

ROBERT FROST

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Robert Frost left us this morning, and the world will mourn him.

The question is whether we should mourn that he will no longer be with us or whether we should rejoice that for so many long years of his life he was able to impart to the world his understanding of people, his admiration for their virtues, and his tolerance for their weaknesses.

Robert Frost was born in California, but lived and worked in many States before becoming a citizen of Vermont 43 years ago.

Wherever he happened to be, he left the imprint of his character.

His home in Vermont would not be considered a good farm as farms go.

It was simply a good home to which he could always return from the many places near and far which made demands on his time and profited from his homespun wisdom.

On July 5, 1961, through a joint resolution of the Vermont Legislature, he was chosen poet laureate of the State of Vermont.

At the ceremony, where he was presented with a copy of the resolution, he read a simple poem:

ON BEING CHOSEN POET OF VERMONT

Breathes there a bard who isn't moved
When he finds his verse is understood
And not entirely disapproved
By his country and his neighborhood?

In this little poem lies the secret of Robert Frost's greatness and influence. He was understood by his neighbors and he understood them.

Otherwise his poems could not have contained so much of the simplicity and goodness which characterized the author.

meet heavily increased requirements for movement of military personnel, frequently on short notice.

I want to express to these carriers, through you, my appreciation for the timely, effective response demonstrated by those carriers during the crisis.

Mr. President, once again the Nation's supplemental airlines, by filling the military airlift gap during the Cuban crisis, have demonstrated their value to national defense. These carriers have performed with extraordinary merit in every national emergency since their inception shortly after the end of World War II.

I know I do not speak for myself alone when I say "well done" once again to the Nation's supplemental air carriers.

THE BUDGET

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Members of this body to the very thoughtful column written by the distinguished writer and newspaperman Mr. Walter Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann addresses his comments this morning to the question of the budget. The title of his analysis is, "Is It a Crazy Budget?" What the writer attempts to do in this very excellently turned piece is to bring us down to some of the hard facts in the budget problem which face this Government, and particularly this Congress, right now. For example, as we examine the proposed deficit that we are asked to face up to, he raises this question, If we cut taxes, how can we cut expenditures at the same time in a sufficient quantity to meet the deficit that is envisaged?

Putting it in realistic terms, Mr. Lippmann points up the amounts required for our national security and military appropriations. He adds to that the totals required for the manned space program, the benefits to veterans of past wars, and finally the amounts that are demanded in interest payments on the current debt.

This leaves, out of the nearly \$100 billion in the budget request, approximately \$20 billion to run all the rest of the Government of the United States in times like these. He asks, in all seriousness, where there can be found places to cut the \$11.9 billion deficit envisaged out of the remaining \$20 billion in the total Federal budget that remains? In realistic terms, what this article says is that there is a lot of talk about the President's proposal with respect to facing up to our fiscal problems for the year and 2 years ahead.

When we really boil the problem down, in the words of Walter Lippman, what we have to do first, before we balance the budget, is balance the economy of the Nation. We would throw the economy more out of balance if we cut out Federal programs already squeezed into the \$20 billion that are left after payments for defense and interest costs. This would develop as more of a hardship in terms of the economic lifeblood of our Nation, when we recall that if we cut those programs out of the \$20 billion we would be threatened with a worse deficit than happened in 1959 under former

President Eisenhower, and we might be thrown into the throes of a very serious depression.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's assessment of the budget effect and the tax measure be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IT A CRAZY BUDGET?

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is not going to be easy to prove the case for the new budget which superimposes a planned deficit of nearly \$3 billion on top of an involuntary deficit of some \$7 or \$8 billion. It is easier to argue the case—which is novel and highly debatable—when it is done with the modesty and learning of the economic message than when it is done with the dogmatic assertiveness of the tax message. For nothing can be so certain as the tax message says it is and no tax bill can be so unqualifiedly wonderful.

The basic question which will have to be debated for some months to come is whether the budget for fiscal 1964 is likely to do what it is designed to do. Will it, that is to say, cause business to expand, thereby reducing unemployment and using to something nearer full capacity the industrial plant?

The principle of the 1964 budget is a new one. Why should there be need of a new budget principle? Because the country is confronted with an economic problem which first made its appearance toward the end of 1957. The problem arises from the fact that there is a condition of chronic economic sluggishness: the average rate of unemployment has moved up to a new level—from 4 percent for the years from 1947 to 1957 to 6 percent ever since.

The American economy has been sluggish because total demand has been sluggish and capital investment consequently inadequate. This sluggishness is a heavy burden on the Nation. We are not producing each year about \$30 billion of wealth that we have the labor and resources to produce. As a result of this nonproduction tax revenues have fallen, and the chronic sluggishness has produced chronic budget deficits.

The problem of economic sluggishness appeared under Eisenhower and has persisted under Kennedy. It cannot be blamed on either party or on either President. There is something wrong for which we have no generally accepted remedy. As we cannot afford to nonproduce 30 billions annually while we are bearing the great burden of military defense and trying to take care of our expanding population, we must make a bold attempt to overcome the sluggishness. We must take measures to produce the lost 30 billions.

That is what the new budget is designed to do. Actually it is a new experiment for the United States to have a planned budgetary deficit. But it is not a new experiment in the rest of the modern world where all of the advanced nations, if they used our system of accounting, would be showing planned deficits.

The difficulty in adapting the new budget principle to the American situation is that there are so many serious and respectable and successful people who think it is crazy, who think it is ridiculous, and who think it is not far from being a swindle. They are outraged at the idea of the Government going further into debt to make the country richer.

This is not the first time that a true theory looked absurd. The earth, for example, seems flat and is round and it is not so easy to remember how to explain why

it is round. The new theory is that the total demand for goods and services should be approximately large enough to pay for approximately all that labor, plant, and capital resources are capable of producing efficiently.

Those of us who accept this fundamental theory agree that the chronic sluggishness since 1957 has been due to insufficient total demand. We agree, therefore, that demand should be increased, and while this could be done by massive government spending, it is easier and quicker and has less of what the doctors call side effects to do this by reducing taxes. Experience has shown that consumers spend 93 percent of their disposable income, which means the total demand will rise quickly after a tax reduction.

There are not many who now oppose a reduction of taxes. But there are many who believe that the principle on which the administration is acting is crazy and immoral. They are saying that while taxes should be reduced, the budget should be balanced at the same time by reduction of government expenditures.

Have they, one wonders, looked at the figures, and if they have, can they really mean what they are saying? The deficit in the new administrative budget (1964) is estimated at 11.9 billion after tax reduction and tax reform. That is over 10 percent of the total administrative budget which is estimated at 98.8 billion. Where do they think they can find the nearly 12 billion to cut? Presumably they will not wish to cut national defense which takes 55 billion. Nor will they cut space research which takes 4.2 billion. Nor the veterans which takes 5.5 billion. Nor interest on the debt which takes 10 billion. Nor, if they are politically candid, will they cut very seriously the 5.7 billion taken by agriculture.

That leaves 20 billion for everything else. Practically everyone who talks about the wild spending in Washington is talking about those 20 billion. Does anyone think those 20 billion can be cut in half? The truth is that those who mean seriously to cut government expenditures to an amount equal to the deficit must cut defense, or give up the hope of balancing the budget and cutting taxes.

The fact of the matter is, however, that if by some kind of major amputation they did cut expenditures by 10 billion, the result would not be a balanced budget. The withdrawal from the economy of that much demand for goods and services would be a heavy blow at business, and it would cause such a loss of revenue that the budget at the end would be more unbalanced than ever. In all likelihood we would have a serious recession.

There is no getting away from this. There is only one way to balance the budget and that is first to balance the economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

BALANCED BUDGETS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I may be a bit old fashioned, I adhere to the old-time religion—I still believe a balanced budget is better than an unbalanced budget. There has been the emergence of a new theory that an unbalanced budget is not important, because what we must balance is not the budget, but the economy. In my own mind, this is nothing more than a shibboleth, a political phrase designed to confuse people, to be heard on the hustings throughout this country as spokesmen for this fallacious theory proceed to expound and expand it.

I think the people of the United States still yearn and long for the day when we can balance the budget, because I think it is the only way, in the long run, to keep the economy sound.

Frankly, I do not know what it means when I hear people get up and say:

It is important to balance the economy—it is not important to balance the budget.

I do believe that a balanced budget alone is the answer to all our problems, but I am sure an unbalanced budget is the open road to inflation; an unbalanced budget unbalances the economy and I hope we can nail this misleading superintellectual, scramble-egg-headed, nonsensical theory in the head before it becomes a part of the philosophy of those who cannot find a way to balance the budget. They plan, instead, to balance their political fortunes by the exposition of a specious theory based not on logic but on an intent to confuse.

SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent on yesterday, in order to make a speech in Mexico City, but I have read with the greatest interest and attention the proceedings in which the Chair referred to the entire body of the Senate the constitutional question as to whether there could be brought to a close the long, drawn-out discussion upon the issue of whether to take up a rules change.

I deeply feel that the Senate is facing a grave constitutional crisis, and I hope that Senators will consult their consciences in the greatest seriousness, as, in my view, this is as grave a constitutional crisis as we are likely to face in a long time. For the Chair ruled, on the one hand, that a majority of the Senate must determine whether the Constitution applies with regard to that determination. The Vice President said, as appears on page 1158 of yesterday's *RECORD*, in respect to article I, section 5, this the Senate can do by a majority vote. The Chair then answered a parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] again, and the Vice President said only a majority vote is required to change a rule.

This is characteristic of the entire discussion and response to the parliamentary inquiries by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and other Members of the Senate.

If the Senate can change the rules, or stop debate, or decide its constitutional issues, by majority vote, and if a few Members—it would not even take a third—continue to talk so that a majority vote cannot be attained and there is no form of discipline which can direct that it shall be attained, the only discipline left is self-discipline.

The country must clearly understand this, because some kind of discipline must be exercised. For instance, it has been said that the Senate could sit on its hands and grant no appropriations, and bring the machinery of Government to a grinding halt, and subject our whole system of Government to being destroyed. It could do that. So here too a number

of Senators, not even a third, could continue to talk and throw the Senate into complete anarchy, so that it could not act at all, and there would be no authority to make it act.

I only state the issue now. I shall discuss it further. I think it is necessary to bring the issue of a rules change to the country and to the Senate to see if there is a way out of the dilemma of this crisis. The only question is, Shall the Senate be thrown into anarchy, or shall it be a deliberative and acting body under the Constitution?

FRAUD IN LAND SALES TO AGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the many land frauds which involve the sale of lots in areas of our country where the climate is milder than in other parts.

This practice has been exposed in a very interesting series of articles in *Newsday*, a newspaper published on Long Island, N.Y., and recently was revealed in considerable detail in hearings held by the Special Committee on the Aging. I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles by Robert A. Caro be printed in the *RECORD* as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From *Newsday*, Jan. 7, 1963]

MISERY ACRES—THE ADS PUSHING A SENSATIONAL NEW LAND BOOM PAINT GLOWING PICTURES OF NEW HOMESITES IN THE SUN COUNTRY, BECKONING THE WEARY TO A LIFE OF COMMUNAL LUXURY—BUT REALITY IS SOMETIMES HARSH

(By Bob Caro)

MOHAVE COUNTY, ARIZ.—When explorers came to Mohave County in 1858, they found a desert so dry that they had to import camels to cross it.

For a century thereafter, the desert remained largely unchanged. A searing sun baked it in summer. Sandstorms whipped it in winter. Only yucca plants and an occasional mesa broke its endless expanses of gray-brown sand. Recently, however, there was an addition to the landscape—a large sign. "This," the sign says, "is Paradise Acres."

Not that the desert itself has changed. It hasn't. Its millions of parched acres are still all but empty of human habitation. Attempts to discover adequate sources of water have failed. Says a Mohave County official: "There are places out there that a lizard couldn't live in."

But Mohave has become the physical hub of a revolutionary new development in the history of American real estate, the sale of tremendous tracts of raw, often undeveloped acreage, through the mail on low-cost installment plans. This development began in Florida about 1953. Today, no less than 350 separate Florida real estate promotions are being advertised outside that State's borders. Two years ago, the development suddenly burst out on the plains of the Southwest on a scale that dwarfed that of the Florida boom. Hard-selling promoters bought up vast chunks of desert and grazing land in New Mexico, Texas, California, and Arizona at bargain-basement prices, hacked the land up into lots, launched multimillion-dollar advertising campaigns and sold the lots sight unseen at many times the price they had paid, usually on terms of \$10 down and \$10 a month. No one knows the exact dimensions of the boom but estimates of sales for 1962 alone run to \$700 million.

SHOW SOME RESULTS

Some of the promotions spawned by the boom have already produced spectacular results. Florida promoters have created complete new cities, designed mainly for retired persons, on what had been for centuries nothing but desolate wetlands. Carol City, for example, which is not yet on any map, already has 10,000 residents. In Arizona, subdivisions have caused the deserts near Phoenix to blossom with luxurious ranch homes.

Some of the promotions are still highly speculative—holdings on which thousands of lots have been sold are still desolate wetlands or desert—but at least the owners have some sort of plans for an eventual conversion and there is a reasonable chance that it will someday take place.

Some of these promotions, however, seem blatantly worthless. In Florida, they include tracts of land in the Everglades and similar swamps in which there are no roads, and building lots are covered by water much of the year. In Arizona, promoters who include many of the same men behind unpromising Florida ventures have purchased chunks of open desert. Without making—or realistically planning—any improvements at all, they have peddled this land through the mail on a scale so vast that the National Association of Better Business Bureaus has termed the boom "the greatest land scandal in American history" and officials in statehouses across the country are working feverishly to develop laws capable of holding the worst promoters in check.

Mohave County has become the hub of the Arizona boom. The reason is simple. The basis of the boom is land, and if Mohave has anything to spare, it is land. With 13,260 square miles, in fact, Mohave is the fifth largest county in the United States, and since its 1960 population was only 7,736 persons (8,000 of whom live in Kingman, the county seat), there are obviously plenty of square miles open for development.

SOUNDS LIKE PARADISE

Advertisements flooding media in the North make this land seem like the Garden of Eden. "Ten dollars reserves 1¼ acres of Arizona land—\$795 buys it," they trumpet. "Health and wealth for you in the wonderful world of the West. Blue skies nearly every single day, pure air . . . the land of play and outdoor living the year round." The expanses of desert around Kingman, which grow nothing green, have suddenly blossomed out with bright signs advertising "Paradise Acres"—and "Sunward Ho! Ranches," "Desert Rose Rancheros" and "Shangri-La Estates."

Is it, perhaps, a bit warm for Shangri-La? In some parts of the Arizona desert the temperature can reach 140 degrees and the Automobile Association of America warns tourists not to leave their cars for a stroll lest they be sunstruck.

Is it a little short of the amenities of civilization? Kingman's most famous son is Andy Devine and a main street of the city is named Andy Devine Avenue, but after you've looked at the street sign for a while your choice of entertainment is narrowed down to the movie at Kingman's one theater or bingo. When night falls over the desert, blotting out the gaudy "Paradise Acres" signs, there is nothing to be seen but miles of blackness, unrelieved by a single light. You can drive for 50 miles without passing another car.

But the disillusionment is most apparent when you compare one glowing advertisement closely to the reality behind it.

Says an ad for Lake Mead Rancheros: "The rancheros are liveable now. Not raw, undeveloped and inaccessible land . . . laid out, waiting for people . . . water available, roads, electricity, phones . . . wide-open living . . . located in the famous Lake Mead Recreation Area, where 3½ million vacation annually."

selves to the thought that if we are going to be Masons, let us be better Masons. If we pride ourselves on being Americans, let us be better Americans. Let us work for the day when there will be peace on this troubled earth, when every man shall be free, when all of us can follow the dictates of our conscience, when all of us can work together for a better world.

May I read to you, in conclusion, the prayer that was uttered at one of our services this morning, and in which I ask you all to join. "Bless our country, that it may even be a stronghold of peace, and its advocate in the council of nations. May contentment reign within its borders, health and happiness within its homes. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship among all the inhabitants of our land; plant virtue in every soul; and may the love of Thy Name hallow every home, and every heart. Praised be Thou, O Lord, giver of peace."

Ohio's Favorite Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the 6 months since his appointment as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze has proven himself a tireless worker dedicated to the successful administration of his far-reaching Department. More recently, Secretary Celebrezze rendered extra service in his cordial meetings with Premier Amintore Fanfani, of Italy, serving to strengthen the ties between our nations.

The State of Ohio is proud of its favorite son, who has distinguished himself and continues to bring great honors to Ohio.

On Saturday, January 26, at the dinner meeting of the Ohio Society of Washington at the Lawyers Club, Secretary Celebrezze delivered the following inspiring address:

REMARKS BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Since I am a lawyer by trade and since all of us here are from Ohio, it occurred to me that you would indulge me in a stipulation or two about our State.

Without making too fine a legal point of it, I think that in these circumstances we can stipulate that Ohio is a great State—and that all Ohioans are great people.

As a matter of fact, I suppose on this occasion I could probably stipulate that Ohio is the greatest of all States. But that would be bragging, and since—among our many other virtues—we are naturally modest, we'll simply stipulate that we're a great group of people from a great State, leaving the superlatives to someone else. There are, after all, only so many superlatives, and those that New York and Texas haven't cornered, Alaska and California have—or will.

So acknowledging our natural modesty, we will simply confine ourselves to the facts. We will merely note that Ohio was the pioneer State in one of the most brilliant chapters in American history—the development of the Northwest Territory—and that it has been a leader ever since.

We'll merely note that Ohio is blessed with rich soil, abundant water, healthful climate,

and all other characteristics of a fine piece of real estate and that its people are industrious, imaginative, honest, forthright, progressive, conservative, and otherwise—by any standard—quite without fault.

I could, of course, go on. But having stipulated these self-evident facts, I am sure none of us wants to dwell overlong on the past or even on the present. The past is static—at least to the extent that it doesn't get rewritten. And there's not much of us can do about the present—it, too, is in the process of freezing into the past.

But the future. That's where the great game is—always ahead of us. The seed not yet planted, the machine not yet invented, the song not yet sung—these are the things that lead us on.

Now, don't misunderstand me. I don't underrate the past. It is not only important, it is imperative that we understand and interpret the past. It is imperative that we grasp the significance of the present. We must know the past and appreciate the present if we are to command—and not be commanded by—the future.

But granted the most penetrating analysis of the past, the most sensitive appreciation of the present—granted all that, and the future is still an uncertain business.

What will the world be like—10, 20, 30 years from now? What will America be like? What will Ohio be like?

No one, of course, can know with certainty. But we do know that what each of us does or does not do tomorrow may—and in all probability will—have some bearing on the shape of things to come.

The other evening I was in Cleveland helping to celebrate the 70th birthday anniversary of a great and wonderful friend—Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. And I quoted some of Rabbi Silver's own words from an address he had given several years ago.

"We have long been admonished by our sages not to observe the wind too closely lest we fail to sow, nor to regard the clouds with too much concern lest we fail to reap."

I like those words—let us not observe the wind too closely lest we fail to sow or regard the clouds with too much concern lest we fail to reap.

Somehow these words remind me of the traveler who stopped to ask the way of a local citizen. You all know the story of how the local citizen, after deep thought and a number of false starts, finally gave up and said to the traveler: "You can't get there from here."

We are seeking our way to the 21st century. It is just over the horizon, but how do we get there from here? Or more precisely, how do we go about making the world of the 21st century the kind of world we want it to be?

From some of the things you read, you sometimes get the notion that there's no way to get to the 21st century from here and that anyone who tries to figure it out ought to have his head—and even his motives—examined.

I expect that somehow we'll make it, but I think we can stipulate that it's going to take some doing. We're going to have to do a lot of sowing, wind or no wind, and a lot of reaping, clouds or no clouds.

It takes a lot of work to keep a nation like this humming. But work is no problem. We seem to like work, and I am sure we will continue to like it.

The point is that it isn't enough in this day and age—if indeed it ever was—merely to get "A" for effort. The really difficult part is making our efforts, as individuals and as a nation, count. And that means developing and using all our resources.

Up to now, I haven't mentioned my dominant concerns, and I don't intend to burden you with them this evening. But since we are making some stipulations, I think we must stipulate that progress in the fields of

health, education, and welfare are essential to our progress as a nation.

And we have made progress in all these fields. We are spending more money for medical research than any nation on earth, we have provided more education for more people than any nation in history, and we are spending billions of dollars a year to see that no one is destitute.

In short, we have gone to considerable trouble to deal with those problems which are of manifest public concern. The question is, Are we really taking advantage of our opportunities in these fields?

I suggest that merely alleviating human problems is a costly investment. I suggest that this approach belongs to a less enlightened, less resourceful age.

The youth loitering on the street corner, out of school, out of work—is he merely a problem, or does he represent an opportunity?

The once-clean river, laden by waste and debris—is this merely a problem, or does cleaning it up represent an opportunity for progress?

The mentally ill, living out their lives in custodial institutions because known methods of treatment are not available to them—are they merely problems, or do they represent opportunities for constructive action?

In a less enlightened, less resourceful age, the most we could hope to do in dealing with problems of health, education, and welfare was to try to relieve the symptoms.

But times have changed. We now know that it is possible, through timely and constructive action, to prevent many of the problems that have beset humanity throughout the ages.

It seems to me the better part of prudence that we steadily move in that direction—in the direction not only of dealing with problems after they have arisen but in the direction of preventing them from occurring in the first place.

There is nothing, it seems to me, quite so important to our progress and well-being as a nation as increasing the vitality of our educational system. I think you will agree that this becomes more and more evident as we advance further and further into the age of technology.

Consider merely one product of technology—automation. Consider the problems it poses for our educational system—and the opportunities it offers for increased productivity and the manifold benefits that go with it. But we must look upon automation as an opportunity for all—rather than a problem for many—if its true value is to be realized.

Well, I said I wouldn't burden you this evening with these concerns. If I haven't kept my promise, I apologize. But in all candor, I think we must stipulate that the work of the great State of Ohio is not yet done.

I think we must stipulate that Ohio, in common with all the other States, must not rest on past achievements but must keep moving forward—toward the 21st century.

There is bound to be a way to get there from here—if we will but find it.

Adlai Stevenson and the Cuban Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning's edition of the Washington

Post carried a very interesting and informative editorial concerning a situation illustrative of the less effective side of American journalism. The editorial refers to the role played by U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson during the Cuban crisis and subsequent revelations of his actions by a national magazine.

History has wasted no time vindicating Ambassador Stevenson, and I hope that this incident, painful as it has been to Mr. Stevenson, has taught us that eavesdropping and supposition are not suitable substitutes for factual reporting and analysis based on the facts of diplomatic life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUTABLE MUNICH

"We're eyeball to eyeball, and I think the other fellow just blinked." So began the celebrated Saturday Evening Post account of the Cuban crisis as written by Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett. Near the end, this passage occurs: "Only Adlai Stevenson, who flew down from New York on Saturday, dissented from the Excomm consensus. There is disagreement in retrospect about what Stevenson really wanted. 'Adlai wanted a Munich,' says a nonadmiring official who learned of his proposal. 'He wanted to trade the Turkish, Italian and British missile bases for the Cuban bases.'"

Last week a curious footnote was written to the melancholy controversy over Mr. Stevenson. President Kennedy confirmed at his news conference that the missile bases in Turkey, Italy and Great Britain are being phased out in favor of Polaris, "a much more modern weapon." Mr. Kennedy concluded by remarking, "I think we are going to be in a stronger position."

In other words, what would have been a Munich in September became a matter of modernization in January. Surely this ought to serve as a sobering lesson to those who persist in evincing a retrospective rectitude about what may or may not have gone on in the secret councils of state during a moment of supreme crisis. Mr. Kennedy would have been derelict if he had not considered the missile bases as part of the diplomatic equation, especially since their removal does not, on the President's testimony, lessen western security. Events have brought Mr. Stevenson and his critics eyeball to eyeball, and it looks suspiciously as if history has just winked.

Quincy Soldier Cited in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress an award given to a brave young man who lives in my district. Pfc. Kenneth B. Eaves of 282 Wilson Avenue, Quincy, Mass., graduated from high school in 1961. He is a former newspaper boy and is a typical young American who is courageously doing his duty in order that peace may be established in the world.

In this far-off place Kenneth Eaves is engaged in combat just as deadly and as dangerous as any battlefield in World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict. It is fitting that we should recognize the great sacrifices being made by these brave young Americans. Their devotion to duty, to God, and country has never been excelled.

I enclose a news story that appeared Thursday, January 24, 1963, in the Quincy Patriot Ledger that reads as follows:

QUINCY SOLDIER CITED FOR VIETNAM HEROISM

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A 20-year-old helicopter gunner from Quincy, Mass., was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross today by U.S. Army Chief of Staff Gen. Earle G. Wheeler for heroism in a battle January 2.

WAS WOUNDED

Pfc. Kenneth B. Eaves of 282 Wilson Avenue, Wollaston, was shot down twice and slightly wounded in the leg in five missions during the 12-hour battle of Ap Bac.

He was 1 of 12 American soldiers awarded medals today.

Three Americans died and Vietnamese Government Forces suffered heavy losses in the battle with Viet Cong rebels about 40 miles south of Saigon.

Eaves, a machinegunner on a U.S. Army troop-carrying helicopter, has been stationed in this embattled country for 9 months.

On one mission, though covered with oil from a burst pipeline, he continued to fire his machinegun until his helicopter crashed. He survived the crash and waded across 100 yards of knee-deep mud to reach a rescue helicopter.

The gunner, his Distinguished Flying Cross dangling from his shirt, said after the ceremony: "I will stay in the Army and I hope to join the Special Forces."

FORMER NEWSBOT

Eaves, a 1961 graduate of North Quincy High School, has been in South Vietnam since last April. From junior high school until his sophomore year at North Quincy he was a Patriot Ledger carrier boy.

Five Distinguished Flying Crosses, six Bronze Medals and one Air Medal were awarded. Seven went to helicopter pilots and crewmembers and the other five were to military advisers.

"This is a dirty, nasty, little war," General Wheeler said in the ceremony at Soc Trang, a major American helicopter base 100 miles southwest of Saigon. Referring to the Normandy invasion of France, he said:

"You know you can get killed here just as easy as you would landing on Omaha Beach."

It was a "lonesome war," he added.

But he said although some might consider the Vietnam war a strange war in a strange country, no American should feel alien in any country fighting for freedom.

Address by Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze
Before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs,
Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on January 19 the National Federation of

Business and Professional Women's Clubs, was honored to have as their main speaker our great Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze. The speech given by my personal friend Secretary Celebrezze set forth as well as anything I have read regarding our national objectives in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS¹ BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Madam President, distinguished colleagues. Seldom do I have the opportunity to speak before an audience whose major concerns, both personal and professional, are so deeply meshed with my own and so broadly extended over the field of government.

We are, each of us, in one way or another, trustees of the public welfare. Together we share the task of administering to the needs of the American people, and together we share the tremendous responsibility of safeguarding the future of democratic institutions both here and around the world.

It is fitting, at the beginning of this new year—at the beginning of this new legislative session—that we should pause to redefine our common goals and to examine some of the issues surrounding them.

Abraham Lincoln once observed that, "If we could first see where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

President Kennedy, on Monday, provided such an overview on the state of the Union.

Today, I would like to make some further observations concerning our national objectives in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

These objectives and the means of meeting them have often been the subject of vigorous public debate.

I am not dismayed by this attention. It reflects the fact that the programs of our Department touch directly, most intimately, the interests and concerns of the individual citizens of our Nation. Their spirited reaction to our programs and proposals is not something to be deplored. It is a very healthy sign of American democracy in action.

It is through such debate that we are able to reconcile differing points of view and produce a consensus that serves as a basis for action.

It is this that propels our Nation forward. When we fail to reach a consensus on matters of urgent public need, as in education, for example, then we are in trouble. For unless our Nation can move forward, not only we Americans but free peoples everywhere are imperiled.

How to resolve the differences that divide and tend to immobilize us, how to keep this Nation moving along on all fronts, is the function of government, the function of politics, the function of responsible citizenship. It is your job and mine.

It requires the free flow of ideas. It requires honest effort at accommodation among the special interests that are bound to exist in a pluralistic society such as ours. It requires broad perspective and broad understanding of all these interests.

I am most concerned that we should understand each other, you and I and the pub-

¹ Before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Grand Ballroom, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., Saturday, Jan. 19, 1963, 12:30 p.m., e.s.t.

The apparent discovery of this loophole in 1960 creates the present serious problem.

INCREASE IN IMPORTS

As a result of the discovery of the discrepancy, the importation of stainless steel sheets and plates has increased by more than 1,000 percent since 1960, a rate of increase which far exceeds any precedent. The level of importation itself, even assuming stabilization of the increase rate, threatens serious injury to domestic producers of stainless steel.

The import situation is clearly revealed by the following chart:

	Imports, schedule A No. 6039700 ¹	
	Pounds	Value
1955-----	32,755	\$19,102
1956-----	30,478	18,881
1957-----	32,574	31,168
1958-----	42,982	11,020
1959-----	15,650	14,261
1960-----	736,746	257,180
1961-----	1,872,900	814,059
1962 (11 months)-----	14,056,178	5,518,943

¹ "Sheets or plates of iron or steel, polished, planished or glanced." Over 90 percent of this total is comprised of stainless steel.

Source: Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Japan is by far the greatest source of these polished steel sheets, accounting for well over 90 percent of the imports during the first 10 months of 1962. Japan's share of imports under paragraph 309 during the month of October 1962 alone was 1,493,018 pounds, a figure which exceeds the all-nation total for the entire period from 1955 through 1960. Foreign competition of this nature threatens immediate injury to the U.S. industry. It is inexcusable that the threat is greatly enlarged by an obvious tariff loophole.

THE ANOMALY HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Acting under legislative mandate, the Tariff Commission has recently completed a series of tariff schedules which collate and simplify the U.S. tariff structure. In cognizance of the anomaly, the Commission would correct it by classifying plates and sheets in a single category, thereby eliminating the illogical result in accordance with the standards of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954. Congress authorized the proclamation of the tariff schedules early last year in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 when the President implements this act, the schedules will have the force of law.

Unfortunately, by reason of the difficulty of conforming the schedules to trade agreements, the proclamation has been delayed.

As the matter is dependent upon successful negotiation with principal foreign nations, there is no way in which domestic stainless steel producers can know when this loophole will be closed.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

Corrective legislation is the only solution which will effectively prevent the continuation of injury. Such legislation would provide for the deletion of the reference to polished, planished or glanced plates or sheets from paragraph 309. No tariff adjustment, or other adjustment assistance relief, may be sought, since polished, planished or glanced sheets have never been the subject of a trade agreement.

There is ample precedent for legislation to correct an inequity of this sort. See Public Law 749, 83d Congress; Public Law 454, 85th Congress. Furthermore, the proposed amendment would not constitute a discriminatory duty against foreign suppliers—the current import duty on polished stainless

steel sheets is 15 percent ad valorem in Japan itself.

In conclusion the industry is certain that it was not and is not the intent of Congress to permit an obvious loophole in tariff structure to imperil the continued existence of a viable segment of domestic industry.

Joseph P. Riley: Dynamic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this moment to call attention to the selection of an outstanding South Carolinian to head our State chamber of commerce in South Carolina.

He is Joseph P. Riley, of Charleston, a dynamic civic leader and businessman.

Joe, as he is called by his many friends in the low country and the State, is a member of countless civic and community organizations.

Well versed in the ways of business promotion, he is a successful real estate executive and will do well for the Palmetto State in cultivating a warm industrial climate for new industry seeking a favorable site to locate.

In his new post, he will play a vital role in directing an organization which influences the economic welfare of our citizens to an important degree through attracting new payrolls by extolling our assets—industrial and otherwise.

The chief position of our South Carolina Chamber of Commerce is in capable hands. I personally extend to Joe Riley my best wishes for a fruitful tenure of office.

In Charleston's two large newspapers, editorials were carried on January 24 and 25 concerning the high regard people hold for Joe Riley. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert these editorials for the information of my people and the Members of the Congress:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Jan. 24, 1963]

BUSINESS TEAM

Selection of Joseph P. Riley of Charleston as the new president of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce brings to State leadership a low countryman already well versed in the ways of business promotion. For years Mr. Riley has been among the leaders in community and civic projects in Charleston. We commend him to the people of South Carolina as a likable and aggressive personality.

Mr. Riley has served as president of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, as a director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and in countless other capacities. He is well acquainted with business and political leaders of this region.

With his associates—G. G. Dowling of Beaufort as vice president for the eastern district and James Chapman of Spartanburg for the western district, and W. G. Edwards of Columbia as chairman of the board—Mr. Riley leads a strong team to represent the

business interests of the entire State. We know something about all these men and the work they have been doing for the public service. The public would be fortunate to obtain their services at high salaries—and they are donating their time. When we wish them well, we are wishing for everybody.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1963]

RILEY ELECTED BY STATE CHAMBER

To the long list of high civic and business offices to which Joseph P. Riley has been elected is added still another—the presidency of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce. The Charleston real estate and insurance executive assumed that office this week.

Few people can claim to have given as much time to worthy causes as Joe Riley has given in the last 25 years. To list the organizations he has served would require a column or more of space.

Among the groups he has headed as president are the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, the Charleston Board of Insurance Underwriters, the Charleston Board of Realtors, the Charleston Lions Club, the Hibernian Society, the Charleston United Fund, the St. Francis Hospital Advisory Board and numerous others. He has served on the board of directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Charleston Development Board, the State development board, the Charleston Red Cross, the Coastal Council of the Boy Scouts, etc.

In his new post, Mr. Riley will direct an organization which plays an important role in the orderly development of a favorable climate for the growth of business and industry in South Carolina. The State chamber remains in capable hands and we wish for Mr. Riley a fruitful tenure of office.

Part 3: Let's Keep the Record Straight — A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro, September 21, 1961-February 20, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in the third part of my chronology of events on Cuba and Castro—we find outlined the growing realization of Latin American countries that Cuba is indeed Communist-controlled, and Castro's admission publicly that he is a Marxist-Leninist "and will be one until the day I die."

Fifteen Latin American countries and the United States have severed diplomatic relations with Cuba. The Organization of American States held a Foreign Ministers' conference on January 31, 1962, and voted—14 to 1, with 6 abstentions—to exclude Cuba from participation in the inter-American system. Later this conference action was to culminate, on February 14, 1962, in Cuba being formally excluded from the Organization of American States.

We find that \$12 million a year in U.S. exports are being sent to Cuba, via Mexico, and that 18 American firms and individuals later are penalized by the U.S.

Commerce Department for their part in ignoring the U.S. embargo.

We find on February 3, 1962, that President Kennedy has decided it is necessary to proclaim an embargo on almost all U.S. trade with Cuba, with the exception "on humanitarian grounds" of exporting certain foods and medicines—thus continuing the embargo which President Eisenhower had originally proclaimed and which then-Candidate Kennedy had criticized as being a gesture which was almost meaningless.

It is good to review history—and with the continuing threat of a Communist Cuba only 90 miles from our shores—it is good to learn from history. Our 20th President, James A. Garfield said:

History is philosophy teaching by example, and also by warning; its two eyes are geography and chronology. History is but the unrolled scroll of prophecy.

The article follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, SEPTEMBER 21, 1961–FEBRUARY 20, 1962, BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

September 21, 1961: President Osvaldo Dorticos leaves Moscow for Peking, after a 10-day visit to the Soviet Union. In a speech at the Kremlin on September 20, Dorticos expresses the solidarity of Cuba with the Soviet Union on all foreign policy issues, and says that Cuban industrial development is based on Soviet credits. "In Havana, Premier Fidel Castro announced that Socialist countries have guaranteed to buy 4,500,000 tons of Cuba's sugar for each of the next 5 years. The message was conveyed to Cuba's Premier by President Dorticos now visiting in Moscow. It means Cuba will be able to sell her total crop of some 6,500,000 tons of sugar for the next 5 years, a gratifying assurance to the Castro government which is having its economic difficulties."

September 22, 1961: President Dorticos is greeted on his arrival in Peking by Communist Chinese head of state, Liu Shao-chi, who praises Cuba as "standing in the forefront of the struggle against U.S. imperialism, which is the common enemy of the peoples of both our countries."

September 25, 1961: Dorticos (addressing a mass rally in Peking) declares that the Nationalist occupation of Taiwan "reminds us of the shameful occupation of a part of our territory in the Guantanamo Base. Cuba and China will recover these territories through a resolute and tenacious prolonged struggle; the imperialists will have to give up these territories." Five men are executed and 64 are imprisoned for terms ranging up to 30 years for alleged anti-Castro activities. "Firing squads already have executed 20 persons this month, 111 this year, and 944 since Castro came into power in January 1959."

October 9, 1961: Cuban Government (in a "white book" presented to heads of 31 foreign missions in Havana) accuses the United States of training anti-Castro invasion forces at 20 U.S. bases and 9 camps in the Caribbean (in Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, the Panama Canal Zone, and at Guantanamo).

October 10, 1961: U.S. State Department declares that Cuban accusations that the United States is training new invasion forces "are not only totally unfounded but are ridiculous." On the same day, Foreign

Minister Raul Roa (in the U.N. General Assembly) accuses the United States of planning a new attack against Cuba which he described as the scene of "the building of a Socialist society 90 miles from a stubborn empire determined to repress the inexorable flow of history." He says that Cuba would welcome "the amicable mediation of a number of American governments to explore the possibilities of worthy and honest negotiations with the Government of the United States."—"Although he implied that these efforts had failed, Latin American sources said that this was Cuba's first public acceptance of the idea of mediation."

October 17, 1961: Council of the Organization of American States (meeting in Washington) votes 20 to 1 (Cuba) to study a Peruvian request for a meeting of American Foreign Ministers to consider taking collective action against Cuba. Peru claims that such action is both justified and necessary to protect the Western Hemisphere from Communist subversion. The Cuban Ambassador to the OAS accuses Peru of acting on orders from the United States.

October 18, 1961: U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk (in a press conference) praises the Peruvian Ambassador to the OAS for having "eloquently described the causes for hemisphere-wide concern with development in Cuba since the Castro government transformed that country into an accomplice of the Sino-Soviet bloc." Rusk adds: "The world will be watching the OAS approach to the Cuban problem. The central question here, as it is in other parts of the world, is: Can people who are devoted to a world of free choice, opposed to a world of coercion, keep Communist intervention from undermining and destroying independent nations?"

October 25, 1961: OAS Council votes to delay action on the Peruvian proposal by referring it to a committee for further study: "It is known that the United States was not in favor of bringing the issue before the OAS just yet, because it has not been able to persuade a majority of the Latin American nations to support any moves against Cuba. . . . Some of the larger and more influential South American countries, notably Argentina and Brazil, are firmly against such OAS action." (Times, London, October 26, 1961): "Brazil and Ecuador led a movement to kill the proposal outright. The smaller Central American nations and the United States sought a compromise formula that would keep it alive. Opposition from the big nations, especially Argentina, Chile, and Mexico, made it impossible to expect outright approval by the council."

November 8, 1961: President Kennedy (at a press conference in Washington) declares that U.S. exports to Cuba now amount to about \$12 million a year.

November 9, 1961: Colombia asks the Organization of American States to convene an Inter-American Foreign Ministers' conference on January 10, 1962, to consider measures for the defense of the Western Hemisphere against any threat posed by the intervention of extracontinental powers. Although the request did not mention Cuba, the Colombian proposal is specifically designed to counter what is regarded, in effect, as the Habana alliance between Premier Fidel Castro's regime and the Communist bloc as well as the subversive activities of Cuban agents in most Latin American countries.

November 11, 1961: Venezuela severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

November 21, 1961: Cuba requests urgent meetings of the U.N. Security Council and the OAS Council to consider her charge of U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic.

November 22, 1961: OAS Council meets (in Washington) to hear Cuban charges refuted by the U.S. delegate as a new law of irrele-

vance, hypocrisy, and slander, and adjourns without taking action.

November 28, 1961: U.N. Security Council ends its debate on Cuban charges of U.S. aggression against the Dominican Republic without taking any action. In the three-day debate, Cuba had asked the Council to brand the United States as an aggressor and to demand the recall of American ships from the Dominican coast. She was supported only by the Soviet Union, but Soviet support did not extend to submitting a resolution in the matters.

November 29, 1961: President Kennedy (at a press conference) declares that the United States would be most concerned if the Castro regime in Cuba attempted to overthrow the existing government in the Dominican Republic or in any other Latin American State.

December 2, 1961: Premier Castro (in a 5-hour television speech) declares: "I am a Marxist-Leninist, and will be one until the day I die." He says "the world is on the road to communism," and he is taking Cuba along that path. He also says: "We must study all the experience in the building up of the world's first Communist society [the Soviet Union]." He rejects neutralism, saying: "There is no half way between socialism and imperialism. Anyone maintaining a third [neutralist] position is, in fact, helping imperialism." Like Soviet Premier Khrushchev, he denounces the cult of personality, and says: "It would be absurd for a single man to make government decisions. . . . I firmly believe in collective leadership. . . . I never have wanted to be a Caesar." He announces that he is forming a "United Party of the Cuban Socialist Revolution," as a single, monolithic party which will lead Cuba to "a people's democracy or the dictatorship of the proletariat."

December 4, 1961: OAS Council adopts the Colombian proposal by a vote of 14 to 2 (Cuba and Mexico), with 5 abstentions (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador).

December 9, 1961: Colombia severs diplomatic relations with Cuba, a few hours after Premier Castro denounced Colombia and Panama as "accomplices of imperialism." Colombia is the 12th nation of the Americas to sever relations with Cuba. The others are the United States, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela.

December 14, 1961: Panama announces that it has severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, and that the break is to be considered effective as of December 8 when Premier Castro made insulting remarks about Panama.

December 18, 1961: Cuba (in a letter to the Organization of American States) rejects a request of the Inter-American Peace Commission that it be allowed to visit Cuba to investigate Peruvian charges of Communist subversion against other American republics and claims that the Castro government is violating human rights. The Cuban note refers to "the servile, corrupt, despotic" Government of Peru, and the "abject submission and repugnant immorality of the Inter-American Peace Commission." (The Commission is an autonomous body of the OAS, whose members are from the United States, Colombia, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Venezuela.)

December 20, 1961: U.S. Commerce Department announces it has taken action penalizing 18 firms and individuals for illegal shipments of aircraft, automotive and other equipment to Cuba via Mexico. A Department statement says: "There has been great effort on the part of the Castro regime to attempt to obtain U.S. parts and equipment in the face of the U.S. embargo."

December 22, 1961: OAS Council (meeting in Washington) agrees to hold the Foreign Ministers' Conference, convoked at Colom-

¹ Sept. 21, 1961–Sept. 20, 1962, excerpted from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs. September 1962–October 1962 from New York Times.

bia's request, at Punta del Este, Uruguay, on January 22 (originally scheduled for January 10). "The 19-to-0 vote [Cuba abstained; Mexico, which opposed the conference, was absent] did not reflect the sharp division that has persisted among the 21 member nations of the Organization of American States on the desirability of considering collective action on the Cuban problem. The question today was limited to the date and place of the ministerial conference."

January 2, 1962: Premier Castro (at a mass rally in Havana to celebrate the 3d anniversary of the overthrow of the Batista regime) declares: "We reiterate that we are Marxist-Leninists and we do not repent it." He attacks the OAS Foreign Ministers' meeting (to be held in Punta del Este on Jan. 22), and warns "governments of America sold to [United States] imperialism who are willing to attack a brother people" against any military adventure. He says that if any new invasion force attacks Cuba, "we will exterminate [them] to the last man." "The Premier backed his statement with a display of military might supplied by his Communist allies. Soviet-built MIG fighter jets, multirocket launching units and twin anti-aircraft guns were shown during a 90-minute military parade."

January 3, 1962: Expert on cannon law, Msgr. Dino Staffa of the Vatican Secretariat of State, declares to the press that Premier Fidel Castro and certain officials of his regime have fallen under automatic excommunication because they are responsible for "impeding and imprisoning" Roman Catholic b'shops. He says the excommunication has been incurred without formal announcement.

On the same day, the U.S. State Department makes public a document entitled "The Castro Regime in Cuba," which was submitted by the United States on December 6 to the Inter-American Peace Committee (an organ of the OAS). The document says that "as a bridgehead of Sino-Soviet imperialism within the inner defenses of the Western Hemisphere, Cuba under the Castro regime represents a serious threat to the collective security of the American republics."

January 4, 1962: Government announces the execution of an anti-Castro guerilla leader, Margarito Lanza, convicted of killing three militiamen. "It was the first execution to be announced in 1962. Firing squads killed at least 136 Cubans in 1961 and an estimated 968 since Fidel Castro assumed power 3 years ago."

January 10, 1962: Soviet news agency Tass announces that the Soviet Union and Cuba have signed a trade protocol for 1962, which provides for "a considerable increase" of trade between the two countries. Under the agreement Cuba will export sugar, alcohol, rum, tobacco, canned fruit, nickel ore, and other products to the Soviet Union. The latter will export to Cuba oil and petroleum products, ferrous and nonferrous metals, chemicals, fertilizers, sawn timber, cellulose, paper, cotton, wheat, flour, animal fats and vegetable oils, various plants and equipment, instruments, and other commodities. The Associated Press quotes Cuban Foreign Ministry sources as having said that the Cuban-Soviet protocol provides for trade worth \$700 million between the two countries, a rise of \$150 million over 1961.

January 18, 1962: Inter-American Peace Committee publishes a report (approved unanimously by the five members of the committee—Colombia, El Salvador, Uruguay, Venezuela, and the United States), which denounces Cuba's ties with communism, subversion, and violations of human rights. The report declares: "Such acts represent attacks upon inter-American peace and security as well as on the sovereignty

and political independence of the American States, and therefore [constitute] a serious violation of fundamental principles of the inter-American system."

January 22, 1962: Conference of Foreign Ministers of the 21 American Republics meets in Punta del Este, Uruguay, to consider collective action against Cuba.

January 31, 1962: OAS Foreign Ministers Conference votes by a two-thirds majority—14 to 1 (Cuba), with 6 abstentions (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico), to exclude Cuba from participation in the inter-American system. President Osvaldo Dorticos of Cuba declares that the exclusion of Cuba from the OAS will convert the organization into a "political-military bloc at the service of the United States." He says: "You may expel us but you cannot extract us from America. You may put us out of the OAS, but the United States will continue to have a revolutionary Cuba 90 miles from its shores." On the same day (Jan. 31), President Kennedy declares (at a press conference in Washington) that he is satisfied with the outcome of the Punta del Este Conference. He says: "It is the first time the independent American States have declared with one voice that the concept of Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system."

February 3, 1962: President Kennedy proclaims an embargo on almost all United States trade with Cuba, with the exception—"on humanitarian grounds"—of the export to Cuba of certain foods and medicines. The embargo (which goes into effect Feb. 7) will stop U.S. imports from Cuba of tobacco, industrial molasses, and vegetables—thereby depriving Cuba of an annual income of about \$35 million—"Through sales of sugar, tobacco and some other food products, the Cubans are thought to have earned about \$100 million in the free world last year. The U.S. action thus is expected to reduce Cuban dollar income by about one-third." (New York Times, Feb. 4, 1962): "The embargo * * * is frankly described * * * in the serious Eastern press [of the United States] as a unilateral act meant to compensate in part for the failure of the OAS to act as a punitive body."

February 4, 1962: Premier Castro denounces (at a mass rally in Havana) the U.S. trade embargo as "another economic aggression." In answer to the exclusion of Cuba from the OAS, voted by the American Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este, Castro issues a "Second Declaration of Havana" which states that the Punta del Este conference has shown the OAS "in its true light [as] nothing more nor less than the U.S. Ministry of Colonies."

February 7, 1962: Brazilian Foreign Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas (in a report to the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies on the Punta del Este Conference) defends Brazil's abstention in the vote excluding Cuba from the OAS. He says that the American Republics should negotiate with Cuba rather than isolating her. He declares: "It is not true that Cuba is lost as a nation for coexistence with the other countries of the hemisphere." He denies that the U.S. delegation tried to use economic pressure on the six countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico) which abstained in the vote on Cuba.

February 8, 1962: Argentina severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

February 11, 1962: Cuban Revolutionary Council, headed by Jose Miro Cardona, announces (in Miami, Fla.) the formation of a hemispherewide anti-Communist, anti-Castro alliance. The announcement lists among the adherents Pres. Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, former Pres. Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin of Puerto Rico, former Pres. Luis

Batlle Berres of Uruguay, Gov. Carlos Lacorda of the state of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, Victor Raul Haya de la Torre and Eudocio Ravines, leftist leaders in Peru, and many others. The primary object of the body is described by Cardona as inter-American action against the Castro regime and internationalization of the struggle of Cuban exiles to free their country from communism.

February 14, 1962: Cuba is formally excluded from the Organization of American States by the OAS Council—thereby carrying out the resolution voted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este.

February 15, 1962: U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee rejects a Czechoslovak-Rumanian resolution calling on the United States to cease "interference in the internal affairs of Cuba." (All Latin American countries—except Cuba—vote against this resolution.)

February 20, 1962: United States asks its NATO allies to prohibit voluntarily trade in strategic materials with Cuba and to reduce in general their trade with that country. The request is submitted to the Permanent Council of NATO in Paris.

Swede Nelson and the Carens Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an excellent article by the able, distinguished writer of the Boston Traveler, Tim Horgan, concerning my dear friend, the incomparable N. V. (Swede) Nelson, recent recipient of the Carens Award at Boston.

This award, given annually to the person who, in the opinion of the committee, has done most for football in New England for the year, is a very great honor, and its presentation to Swede Nelson this year has met with overwhelming public acclaim and approval.

Swede Nelson has distinguished himself in many ways—great football star in his college days at Harvard, well-known coach and football expert, successful businessman, resolute advocate of highest standards of sportsmanship, many-sided humanitarian and an inspiring human being.

Devoted in his many activities for worthwhile, charitable causes, diligent, effective worker for the underprivileged, the handicapped, and the helpless, Swede Nelson throughout the years has furnished a striking example of noble achievement and unselfish service.

A widely known wit and accomplished after-dinner speaker, he has given most generously of his time, efforts, and amazing talents to innumerable fine causes in Boston, New England, and throughout the Nation. He is loved, admired, and respected by all who know him and by a host of people of every rank and station throughout the country.

Certainly no one has ever received this valued award, given in the honor

of the late, very distinguished George Carens, famous Boston newspaperman and sports authority, who more truly and wholeheartedly exemplifies the highest aims and traditions of American football and dedicated citizenship than Swede Nelson.

I congratulate my beloved friend, Swede, and his lovely family upon this great honor, and wish for him and for them continued success and true happiness for many years to come.

The article follows:

SWEDE GIVES ENTIRE LIFE TO FOOTBALL
(By Tim Horgan)

Nils V. Nelson visited his barber the other day, and in the course of his once-over-lightly, the barber wondered about Swede's age.

"I'm 43," Swede reported.

"On one side," the barber scoffed.

"You cut the hair," Swede told him, "and I'll tell the jokes."

That's the way it should be, of course, because nobody tells a joke quite as well as this loyal son of Harvard, 1918. Very few have told so many, also. This is partly because it all began back in 1914, when no less than the late A. Lawrence Lowell advised the toastmaster at the Harvard freshman football banquet: "You were terrible, but you can be very good if you stick at it."

Since this came from the president of his beloved Harvard, Swede went out and set a world record for tenacity.

He had made approximately 150 talks per year after year since, although his arthritis and those 43 years of age have cut him to 40 or 50 recently. If there are people in New England who haven't heard Swede speak, they haven't been in New England more than an hour.

"Out in the open spaces," he begins launching his favorite gag of all time in that rollicking voice, "out West, they do a lot of proselyting. That's a Harvard word, I can't spell it. I can't even pronounce it, but it sounds good."

It sounds better every time he tells it, and nobody enjoys it more than Swede himself. "I speak," he says, "because I love it." That's part of the reason.

Swede is one of those men everybody knows but very few know much about. One of the least known aspects of this incomparable buffoon is that behind the raucous guffaw and the wagging cigar is a superb and dedicated man.

This was discovered when the football writers, in a startling turn of events, gave Swede an award yesterday. The man who has given so many awards, they finally named one after him, got the George C. Carens Memorial Trophy. Its for the person who has done the most for New England college football over the years, and the choice was perfect, if not inevitable.

Nobody has done more for New England college football, in his own inimitable way, than Swede. This is even apart from his work on the Bulger Lowe Committee, for the Gridiron Club, or as a former Harvard coach. It's also not only because he has entertained more football groups than the shotgun formation.

What Swede does is live, breathe and, mostly, talk football with a purpose. He's a man with a message, a message to the effect that people are good, life is wonderful, and football is the best part of both.

He carries the message wherever he goes, because it's as much a part of him as his wit. In fact, it's why he goes to so many places, particularly where there are teenagers.

In the past 2 weeks, he has spoken at Somerville and Beverly High Schools, the Shirley

Industrial School and the Dedham County Jail or maybe he's kidding. He goes to the teenagers and he says: "I understand you kids because I spent the best 9 years of my life in high school."

The kids love him for it and are thus available for the message, which Swede slips in between jokes, in epigrammatic form. Some of his favorites:

"The greatest thing in life is enthusiasm. The finest things of life are born out of it. Everything in life is dull and drab without it."

"Never hate in the plural. Dislike individuals if you want, but don't indict a whole race or a nation because of an individual."

"Truth is the best defense of all. It's better than a nine-man line."

His goodness, as much as his humor, makes Swede an extraordinarily popular man, which is why he shouldn't have been so genuinely surprised to get the Carens Award. After all, Swede admits: "Everywhere I go somebody is opening a door for me or holding my coat or giving me two scoops of ice cream."

Columnist Appraises the First 2 Years of the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to an editorial by David Lawrence in U.S. News & World Report, January 28, 1963. Mr. Lawrence makes a keen appraisal of the President's first 2 years in office and his analysis is a serious indictment of the failures of this administration. My purpose in including it as a part of these remarks is not to make of it a partisan issue, but in the hope that President Kennedy made be made to realize before it is too late that his policies of playing politics at all costs may prove disastrous for this Nation.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AFTER 2 YEARS

(By David Lawrence)

There are two ways to appraise an administration at a given time, either in terms of political popularity or by a realistic evaluation of the actual progress that has been made in the Nation's economy.

If an election were held today, President Kennedy would win a second term. This would be due not to his own efforts on television, radio, and in the press to present an image of successful leadership, but largely to the failure of the Republican Party, both inside and outside of Congress, to tell the American people the other side of the story.

The record of the Republicans as an opposition party in the last 2 years is the poorest in a half century of American politics. The Republicans have ignored the lessons of the past and feel they must fashion their strategy to fit Democratic Party concepts. They argue among themselves about "liberalism" and "conservatism," or about "old Republicanism" and "new Republicanism," while they should be uniting to tell the country of the scandals that are emerging under the Kennedy administration. For rarely in history have governmental powers been so

brazenly used to build a national political machine.

The administration has kept the peace. After waiting until Soviet missiles were actually assembled and emplaced in Cuba, President Kennedy finally acted with a show of firmness. Even though his action was belated, and there is still considerable doubt as to whether the danger has been removed, the fact remains that on balance today the electorate would on this specific issue vote to sustain the President.

But does the country know the facts? Why hasn't the truth about the illfated invasion of Cuba in April 1961 been disclosed? Is it conceivable that our military chiefs did not protest an invasion plan that failed to provide adequate air cover of some kind? If they did recommend it, did the President disregard their advice? Didn't this debacle give the Soviets their opportunity to threaten us and bring on our worst war scare in recent history?

Premier Khrushchev concedes that the United States now has at least 40,000 nuclear bombs and warheads and that war is unthinkable. So the average man feels more secure for the time being.

If, to be sure, the Republicans hadn't been asleep at the switch, they would have been pointing out that the military strength of this country could not have been built up to its present superiority in just 2 years.

The charge that the Eisenhower administration permitted a "missile gap," for instance, is no longer heard in debate. It remains nevertheless as one of the biggest falsehoods ever perpetrated in American politics.

The Republicans can hardly rely on the present administration to give credit for what was really achieved militarily and on the diplomatic front in the preceding 8 years.

Measured in the perspective of history, the administration has failed to come to grips with the fundamental problems of our economic life. Most important is the inability either to balance the budget or to cure the unemployment problem. The President's recent messages call for budget deficits which will run until 1967. The administration intends to stand in 1964 on a platform of deficit spending which, without a curtailment of spending on nondefense items, must result in gradually cutting down the purchasing power of the dollar.

The economy at present is bogged down by labor troubles. The longshoremen's strike, which has obstructed the Nation's shipping, and the newspaper strikes in New York City and Cleveland do not augur well for the future. Such situations are not conducive to business planning despite the stimulants to private spending being offered through tax cuts.

For the President has been patently unwilling to deal with the growing monopoly power of labor unions. The administration has not hesitated to harass and slander American businessmen, but it has cravenly refused to use its inherent powers to quell the conspiracies that restrain commerce and provoke costly strikes.

From the standpoint of political morality, the huge campaign funds collected by labor unions from their members present a glaring example of an unholy alliance between the administration and a large group that enjoys a special privilege in America today. The country has been told little about this, and the Republican Party has not fought hard enough for an investigation by Congress to expose the truth.

To curry favor with political groups, President Kennedy, by his Executive orders on a variety of subjects, has ignored the law of the land. Yet the Republicans have failed to emphasize this usurpation of governmental power.